

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 are all the claims pending in the present application. Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the previous objections and claim rejections. However, claims 1-16 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Venkitaraman et al. (U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2003/0161287)<sup>1</sup>.

The single applied reference Venkitaraman is directed to an IP mobility solution for mobile networks defining mobile routers detachably connected to one or more mobile network nodes. When attached to the mobile router, the mobile network nodes create a binding between their home address and a home address of their attached mobile router. The mobile router creates a binding between its mobile subnet prefix (or home address) and a care of address. The bindings are sent to various correspondent nodes having sent packets non-optimally to the mobile network nodes. The bindings are updated, as appropriate, responsive to movement of the mobile network to other networks, including other mobile networks, and/or responsive to the mobile nodes detaching from the mobile network and roaming independently to other networks, including other mobile networks. The correspondent nodes store the bindings and updates, if any, in a binding cache and consult the binding cache to determine how packets should be directed on next attempts to reach the mobile network node. *See Abstract of Venkitaraman.*

Applicants amend independent claim 1, as indicated herein, and submit that Venkitaraman does not disclose or suggest at least, "wherein when said mobile host moves into a range of a different access point, said mobile host retains the prefix information of the gateway," as recited in amended claim 1. Support for this amendment can be found in numbered

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants note that the Examiner mistakenly indicates that only claims 1-6 and 10-15 are rejected on page 2 of the Office Action. However, it appears that the Examiner intended to indicate that all of the pending claims are rejected over Venkitaraman.

paragraphs 76-82 of the originally filed specification. According to Applicants' understanding of Venkitaraman, nowhere does this reference disclose or suggest the above-quoted feature.

Applicants submit that independent claim 10 is patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-9 and 11-16 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 10.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

Date: May 5, 2008